DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 292 EA 029 054

AUTHOR Henderson, James E.
TITLE The Key to Leadership Effectiveness--Leader Authenticity.
PUB DATE 1998-03-00
NOTE 38p.; Paper prepared for the Annual National Conference on Creating the Quality School (7th, Arlington, VA, March 26-28, 1998).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Behavior; *Administrator Effectiveness; Elementary Secondary Education; Leaders; *Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles
IDENTIFIERS *Authenticity

ABSTRACT

When an education leader develops and maintains policies that line up with the imperatives of ethical and authentic behavior, this defines the character of both the leader and the organization. Some of the questions surrounding this assertion are examined in this paper. It looks at what it means when a leader behaves in an authentic fashion, how the concept of leader authenticity relates to ethical and effective leadership, and the impact that authenticity has on school administrators, teachers, and staff members. The idea of authenticity, what it is and its effectiveness in a leader, is explored, as is the troubling results brought about by inauthenticity. The paper examines an earlier study on the concept of authenticity in leaders and then provides an overview of authenticity-related literature. Discussed in conjunction with this research are studies on personality and leadership, research that has delved into the social-psychological aspects of leadership, attribution theory, and the role of interpersonal attraction. Also described is the definition of leader authenticity, recent studies on authenticity, how authenticity functions in teachers and leaders, and authenticity beyond the school environment. It is concluded that there is a strong link between ethical leadership and a leader's authenticity. (Contains 79 references.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 419 292

The Key to Leadership Effectiveness -- Leader Authenticity

James E. Henderson

Professor and Dean

Duquesne University

School of Education

Pittsburgh, PA 15282-0502

(412) 396-5577 FAX: (412) 396-6017

E-mail: henderson@duq3.cc.duq.edu

Presented at the 7th Annual National Conference on Creating the Quality School

Arlington, VA

27 March 1998

EA 029 054

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Henderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The Key to Leadership Effectiveness -- Leader Authenticity

> Then Jesus said to the crowds and to his disciples, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat; therefore, do whatever they teach you and follow it; but do not do as they do, for they do not practice what they teach. They tie up heavy burdens, hard to bear, and lay them on the shoulders of others; but they themselves are unwilling to lift a finger to move them. They do all their deeds to be seen by others; for they make their phylacteries (or scripture-filled ornaments) broad and the tassels on their garments long. They love to have the place of honor at banquets and the best seats in the synagogues, and to be greeted with respect in the marketplaces, and to have people call them rabbi. But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all students.
>
> The Gospel according to St. Matthew 23:1-8 (NRSV)

To embrace a value system that seeks the good of others before self, to behave in concert with one's expressed beliefs, and to continually act purposefully and effectively in service of that value system, are central ingredients in the interplay among leadership, authenticity, and ethical behavior. This article explores those interrelated concepts, giving special attention to the notions of leadership, and especially authentic leadership.[1] Moreover, this discussion is rooted in a review of recent leadership literature, as well as an exploration of "classic" studies in administration and the social sciences.

The educational leader's inclination and ability to develop and maintain organizational systems and policies that line up with the imperatives of ethical and authentic behavior not only define the character of the leader, but also the character of the organization itself and the quality of the interactions among organizational constituents. Simply put, if I am a leader, and I "practice what I teach" per Jesus' admonition to his followers, then I will have integrated beliefs and actions. I will also then serve as a model for the actions of others in the organization and will have defined the standards against which their behavior -- and my future behavior -- will be judged. On the other hand, if I am espousing ethical and other-serving behavior, but am behaving in a deceitful, selfish way, I am a hypocrite. (Interestingly, in the New Testament Gospels, Jesus reserved his strongest rebukes for the hypocritical individuals of that time . . . and ours.)

---

[1] An earlier treatment of this topic is found in T. Rusnak (Ed.), *An Integrated Approach to Character Education*. (pp. 77-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

What does it mean, though, for leaders to behave in an authentic fashion? How does the concept of leader authenticity relate to ethical *and* effective leadership practices in schools? What implications does the relationship among ethics, leadership, and authenticity have for school administrators, teachers, and staff members? These questions frame the balance of this paper's discussion. That discussion is based upon a review of classic studies and emerging writings in education, leadership and administration, and the social sciences. [2]

Introduction to Leader Authenticity

To be authentic, to be genuine, to be real, to be credible are clearly great virtues in our society and, some would suggest, are the bases for ethical behavior. Respect is accorded to those who are observed to behave in an authentic fashion. Inauthentically behaving persons are viewed with distrust and disdain. Authenticity is a cultural precept, derived from ancient traditions of chivalry and respect for admired foes, that even if one disagrees with another person, one will hold that foe in esteem if the foe's actions and expressions are viewed as being authentic. An authentic person is viewed as possessing character. Conversely, if one is perceived as behaving in an inauthentic fashion, severe limitations emerge to hinder that person's interpersonal ability to function effectively. Although some may view the inauthentic person as having worthy traits and talents, that apprehension seems to be nullified by the misgiving engendered by the perception of inauthenticity, unethical behavior, and questionable character. The implication of that relationship is important for leaders of organizations. Whether or not the leader is always agreed with, or even liked by followers is not the issue here. Rather, it appears that the extent to which the leader's followers view the leader as expressing and behaving in an authentic fashion will affect the interpersonal effectiveness of the leader, and will influence the climate of the organization itself. In fact, in an early discussion of this concept, Halpin (1966) views perceived leader authenticity as the critical difference between organizations with "open" versus "closed" climates.

Specifically defining and operationalizing the concept of authenticity has been an elusive task. In a comprehensive treatment of the authenticity concept, Terry (1993) refers to authenticity as "genuineness and a refusal to engage in self-deception" (p. 128). Terry explicates

---

[2] The author has summarized much of his earlier work and writings on the study of authentic leadership in this paper.

reasons why authenticity is important in the study of leadership, but proffers no direct measure. Further, Kouzes and Posner (1993) deal with a definition of a presumed analog of authenticity -- credibility. They assert that credibility "is mostly about consistency between words and deeds" (p. 47). Kouzes and Posner also indicate that such consistency between words and practice is necessary, but insufficient for the notion of credible leadership. They indicate that leadership credibility is contingent upon the notion that "leaders must do what we say we will do" (p. 47); i.e., leaders must be ethically accountable for their own actions and for the actions of the entire organization.

Halpin (1966) discussed the authenticity concept as a serendipitous by-product of his organizational climate studies. He reinforced the notion that authenticity was a "fuzzy" concept, heretofore defying operational measure. Halpin marked out certain guideposts to the development of an authenticity measure. He engaged in post hoc speculation about the concept. However, Halpin did not attempt to develop a direct measure of authenticity. Seeman (1953, 1960) did attempt such an elaboration. The development of the inauthenticity, or ambivalence measure grew out of Seeman's (1953) work in role conflict and leadership ambivalence. In a subsequent analysis, Seeman (1960) went on to indicate that a school leader may be seen as inauthentic if "his occupancy of (a) high status position influences his decision making in an unrealistic way because of the stereotype he holds regarding the requirements of that position" (p. 103). Seeman found that school superintendents actually experienced greater choice difficulty than they at first indicated on the questionnaire. He saw denial as one example of inauthentic leader behavior and implicitly equated "realism" with leader authenticity. Seeman (1966) later reflected on his initial findings:

> I would suggest that the concept of inauthenticity may here be applied to the status of organizational leader. In the questionnaire data, these executives are responding as "real leaders" should - with decisiveness and conviction. They are putting to work a stereotypic conception of the leader as one who is characterized by clarity of decision; but is a clarity which, the interviews show, they do not actually possess . . . . In what sense is a false self-image involved? It should be apparent that I am not referring to dissembling on the questionnaire. It would be uninteresting (again, like the con man) if the leader simply wishes to impress the researcher with his virtuosity as a decision-maker, hence fictionalizes his decisiveness. This is not a false self-image, it is merely a lie. What is required, then, is a degree of self-deception. Those who are inauthentic in the sense now under discussion have accepted the stereotype as their guide; but in one way or another, the mechanism of denial allows them to ignore the falseness of their self-image. (p. 70)

Using the notions of overreaction to the occupancy of a given status and making unrealistic decisions due to the perceived demands of that status, Seeman (1960) constructed a plausible measure of leader inauthenticity. However, in attempting to validate Seeman's inauthenticity measure, Brumbaugh's (1971) predictions were not sustained. Others explored authenticity from a number of interesting and potentially useful perspectives, but a direct, validated measure of authenticity was lacking.

Purpose of the Original Leader Authenticity Study

The purpose of my original study (Henderson, 1982) was to define the concept of authenticity in a constitutive manner, and to develop and test the validity of the operational measure of that concept. The focus of the study was on the followers' perception of leader authenticity. I assumed that one could not be authentic or inauthentic, ethical or unethical, in a vacuum. Rinder and Campbell (1952) supported this position:

> Generalizing this point of view to the feelings of social group membership, we would say that a person is "inauthentic" who denies any part of the experiences and identifications which have become a part of him. For a person who has lived as a participant in several cultures or sub-cultures, denial of the values of any one of them is apt to symptomize inauthenticity. (p. 271)

Through their further elaboration, Rinder and Campbell offered a situational definition of the authentic social-self:

> The points we have been trying to make are these. Human conduct is the product of the interplay of the self and others, the individual and the collectivity. Any theory of human behavior, and especially one like Existentialism which has philosophico-ethical tenets regarding authenticity, must not emphasize either aspect of this interactive process at the expense of the other. Furthermore, the tendency to think of social identification in terms of such primitive (General Semantics would call it "Aristotelian") two-valued dichotomizations as Jew-Gentile is itself symptomatic of unimaginative, if not prejudiced, thinking . . . . Returning to the notion of man's "real" or "authentic" self, we must note that this is an oversimplification, for man actually has a number of selves. We have selves corresponding to each of the roles and identities we have assumed or found in life. We are husband, father, academician, political participant, worshipper, consumer, etc., and the organization which we make of this plurality of roles and identities constitutes our personality and individuality. Our authenticity consists in our developing and integrating within ourselves both a self and a self-consciousness for those identifications and roles which our unique life histories have provided us. Inauthenticity consists in our denying and being unable to integrate some facts of our life career within

> the rest. This then is our baseline for authenticity. Whether the evasion, repression, or denial of roles and selves to which we have been exposed is cowardly, creative, or neither, it nevertheless constitutes the phenomenon we call "inauthenticity." (1952, pp. 273 - 274)

Understanding that the leader was thoroughly immersed in a social environment, it became apparent to me (Henderson, 1982) that the "significant others" in the environment were the leader's followers. In a social psychological sense, salience was ascribed to followers' perception of, and reaction to, the leader's behavior, rather than leader self-perception. Halpin (1966) even argued that one's protestation of authenticity was negatively correlated with authentic behavior and others' perception of that behavior. In other words, the leader who claimed to be authentic, to use a Shakespearean phrase, "doth protest too much." Authentic and ethical leadership was viewed as not being what the leader said; rather, it was what the leader was observed to have done.

Etzioni (1968) postulated a typology of the extent to which societal appearances and realities were congruent. Besides describing a social condition that was inauthentic and one that was authentic, Etzioni differentiated between unresponsive organizations that presented the image of ethical sensitivity to members' needs, and like organizations that exhibited no such image:

> In asking to what extent a society is responsive to its members' needs, the differences between appearances and underlying realities must be taken into account. We find on the personality level a surface conformity coupled with an underlying rejection, e.g., when open rejection seems dangerous . . . . We find on the institutional level appearances of participation (or other aspects of responsiveness) covering underlying exclusion . . . . To formalize these conceptions in the form of definitions, one may refer to a social condition as: authentic, when the appearance and the underlying structure are both responsive to basic human needs; as alienating, when both the appearances and structure are unresponsive; and as inauthentic, when the underlying structure is unresponsive but an institutional or symbolic front of responsiveness is maintained. The fourth combination, of an alienating appearance covering a responsive reality, is rare and unstable. It may be referred to as a latent authentic condition. (pp. 880 - 881)

This formulation was interesting in that it described social conditions that affected an organization's members, especially as those conditions reflected the appearance and underlying value structure of the organization. The notion of perceived congruence between appearance and

underlying reality was viewed as being important to the leader's authenticity and character, and not just to organizational authenticity.

Authenticity-Related Literature

Studies in Administration

Based upon the findings in the OCDQ study, Halpin (1966) presented inferences about the authenticity concept that helped to guide my (Henderson, 1982) investigation. In the study of the organizational climates of schools, Halpin did not have an *a priori* assumption about the concept of authenticity. In exploring the findings, however, he came to realize that the concept of authenticity, however fuzzy it was, provided interesting insights and explanations regarding the results. Halpin indicated that he was struck by the disparity between two types of schools in the sample. He observed that, in the open schools, the characters (the principals and teachers) seemed purposeful in their behavior. In the other schools, the closed schools, teachers and administrators seemed to act in a two-dimensional fashion. That is, the people who populated the closed climate schools did not act for real -- they seemed merely to be playing out a part in a less than real life drama. In the open schools, the professional roles of the teachers and the administrators appeared to be subordinate to what the people filling those roles actually were. The teachers and administrators were able to step outside and beyond their role requirements as the situation dictated and were able to maintain an obvious sense of self. In the closed schools, teachers and administrators had their primary sense and source of identification in their role. This salience of role tended to have participants in the school regard their function ritualistically and served to have the participants keep each other at arms' length, thereby lessening the possibilities for authentic interpersonal relationships.

In discriminating between those who would be authentic and those who would be inauthentic, Halpin (1966) suggested that the principal who was intent on task accomplishment without losing sight of the necessity of being considerate to staff members seemed to be the more authentic individual. This definition and this principal description was reminiscent of the "great person" leader as described by Bales (1958), Carter (1954), and by Getzels and Guba (1957) as a transactional leader, and later by Burns (1978) and others as a transformational leader, one who would not simply transact business with followers but who would empower them in true ontological and ethical fashion. In fact, an entire issue of Educational Leadership was devoted to this topic (Brandt, 1992). In these formulations, the leader was able to move the organization

toward task accomplishment, and at the same time attend to the social needs of his or her followers. The ability to solve tasks and accomplish goals and provide social support for the follower participants in the organization was seen as a highly desirable, though extremely rare quality. Halpin indicated that this kind of principal could stand for something, and was open in letting the teachers and other school publics know what the school's mission was. In short, the authentic principal exhibited strength of character.

Halpin (1966) also contrasted the open principal's behavior with the behavior of the principal in the closed climate school. The "closed" principal did not move the organization to goal accomplishment and typically was not concerned with the need for social support of the school's teachers. The closed principal tended to resist change, to remain aloof from his or her followers, and to ritualize the practices of the organization. Halpin speculated that the closed principal accentuated his or her closeness in a cyclical fashion. The principal's behavior showed itself to be two-dimensional and resistant to change. This created the impression with the teaching staff that the principal was not authentic, not to be trusted, and not capable of having authentic interactions. Faced with this perception on the part of the staff, the principal tended to become even more rigid in terms of role interpretation and production emphasis. This continued the cycle that seemingly never ended.

Halpin also asserted that within a closed climate organization a person's perception was distorted through the selective apprehension of reality. That is, the inauthentic individual within the organization selected out or disregarded any perceptions that would disagree with the perception that the person held regarding self or relations with others. Halpin went on to indicate that these people, who selectively distorted reality, tended to group together to provide mutual support. This could be explained in terms of Festinger's (1957; 1964) cognitive dissonance theory. Those individuals chose to resolve the dissonance aroused by conflicting perceptions through changing or eliminating the discrepant perceptions or cognitions that existed within the organization. Cognitions were distorted to reinforce the individual's apprehension of reality.

The description of the members of the inauthentic group closing ranks was reminiscent of Festinger, Riecken and Schacter's (1956) description of a religious group's response to a disconfirmed prophecy. In a case study investigation, Festinger and his colleagues studied a small religious sect which predicted that the end of the world would arrive on a given date. Naturally, the disconfirmation came. The religious sect was placed in a precarious situation.

They could not deny the disconfirmation of the belief. They could not belittle their extensive preparation which included selling all their worldly goods in preparing to meet their maker. What they did, instead, was seek social support to persuade others that their central belief system was valid even though the specific date and circumstances of the prediction had not yet been validated. This was the kind of relationship Halpin (1966) described as occurring among staff members and schools characterized by inauthenticity. It was not too great an extrapolation to see how this "groupthink" -- based upon fabrications -- could be the breeding ground for individual and collective unethical behavior.

Halpin suggested that the entire concept of authenticity could be explored in relation to three major conceptual frames of reference. The first frame of reference pertained to the marginal person issue. This conceptual framework was concerned with the person who, in coming into a new milieu and in desiring to be accepted in that new circumstance, over-conformed to the norms of his or her new peers. The fear of exposing one's difference in a new situation, gave rise to embracing the group's stance on important issues and to fastidious acceptance and promulgation of the norms of the group. In doing this, the individual functioned inauthentically. The person denied something essential about himself or herself. Halpin related this concept to education in stating that education was a marginal profession characterized by modest wages and professional personnel who typically came from less than the best colleges and less than the best homes. In this case, Halpin asserted that teachers and administrators behaved as other marginal people did. They eagerly over-conformed to what they perceived to be society's expectations for them. A specialized case of this behavior concerned the school principal. The inauthentic principal tended to over-conform to what he or she viewed as the social and work stereotypes that were ascribed to the position of principal.

Goffman (1963) explained this ambivalence -- of wanting to behave authentically, but of being drawn into past or expected behaviors -- in terms of stigmatized individuals interacting with the rest of society:

> Whether closely allied, with his own kind or not, the stigmatized individual may exhibit identity ambivalence when he obtains a close sight of his own kind behaving in a stereotyped way, flamboyantly or pitifully acting out the negative attributes imputed to them. The sight may repel him, since after all he supports the norms of the wider society, but his social and psychological identification with these offenders holds him to what repels him, transforming repulsion into shame, and then transforming ashamedness itself

> into something of which he is ashamed. In brief, he can neither embrace his group nor let it go . . . . This ambivalence seems to be found most acutely in the process of "nearing," that is, of the individual's coming close to an undesirable instance of his own kind while "with" a normal. (pp. 107 - 108)

Likewise, Carling (1962) offered an anecdotal account of over-conformation to social stereotypes:

> I also learned that the cripple must be careful not to act differently from what people expect him to do. Above all they expect the cripple to be crippled; to be disabled and helpless: to be inferior to themselves, and they will become suspicious and insecure if the cripple falls short of these expectations. It is rather strange, but the cripple has to play the part of the cripple, just as many women have to be what the men expect them to be, just women; and the Negroes often have to act like clowns in front of the "superior" white race, so that the white man shall not be frightened by his black brother.
>
> I once knew a dwarf who was a very pathetic example of this, indeed. She was very small, about four feet tall, and she was extremely well educated. In front of people, however, she was very careful not to be anything other than "the dwarf," and she played the part of the fool with the same mocking laughter and the same quick, funny movements that have been the characteristics of fools ever since the royal courts of the Middle Ages. Only when she was among friends, she could throw away her cap and bells and dare to be the woman she really was: intelligent, sad, and very lonely. (pp. 54 - 55)

Halpin's (1966) second framework dealt with the difficulty of interpersonal relations in a cross cultural exchange. In describing Perlmutter's (1959) work, Halpin suggested that teachers and administrators reacted to suggestions and criticism from the outside world in one of two ways. Perlmutter described a situation in which Americans going abroad for the first time encountered foreign cultures which were obviously different from their own. In that situation, the American typically employed one of two responses, especially when the foreign culture presented a dissonance-producing circumstance. For example, if a male visitor to another culture saw that men in that culture typically were refined, enjoyed the arts, and gave full vent to their emotions in public, this situation could produce a great deal of dissonance for the "All-American male." The American could reject the foreign culture as embracing men who were effeminate, or the American could allow for a subtle change in his own value system and could come to even embrace some of the foreign culture he observed.

In like manner, teachers and administrators normally encounter situations in which the public criticizes their function. The reaction to this criticism can be a defensive one. On the other

hand, the reaction can be an incorporation of the suggestion or criticism into an action plan for future improvement depending, of course, on whether the suggestion or criticism would be a valid one. Halpin (1966) suggests that the first response would be inauthentic, while the second response would be authentic.

The inauthentic response could likewise be viewed in terms of Festinger's (1964) reaction formation concept. In the previously described religious sect which had its end of the world prophecy disconfirmed, the members of the sect regarded outsiders (that is, anyone not belonging to their group) as profane and damned. This reaction not only served to insulate the group from the outside world, it also served to solidify the membership into its own belief system. This appeared to be the problem evident in interpersonal relations in a cross cultural exchange.

The third framework that Halpin (1966) presented briefly was a discussion of Erikson's (1956) "crisis of identity." Halpin submitted that the stages a principal and his or her followers went through in moving an organization from a closed to an open organizational climate were roughly similar to the stages that a child and the child's family went through from the time of the child's infancy to the time of the child's maturity. Halpin indicated that there were some adolescents who never achieved maturity just as there were many school staffs that never achieved a truly open organizational climate. He concluded that the conditions and behaviors that would mediate against the person's achieving maturity were psychologically analogous to the conditions and behaviors that would maintain a closed organizational climate in its present state.

A corollary to his investigation of Erikson's (1956) work was Halpin's (1966) description of what he considered to be the critical concept regarding authenticity. Halpin described Schachtel's (1959) work on the emergence of infant focal attention and the emergence of reality. The work described the process through which the infant was able to learn and understand about the reality of the object world. In Schachtel's formulation, the infant should be free from all need driven interests. If the infant were free from anxiety and tensions, any object could be apprehended as to its many different aspects, rather than as to how that object could be used to satisfy the basic need of the infant. In other words, in order to focalize attention on an object "the claim of all other needs and impulses for attention is delayed or abated" (Schachtel, 1959, p. 266). According to Schachtel, the infant could only develop the focal attention necessary for the apprehension of reality in a situation in which he or she could count on the stability of the

environment. In developing that focal attention, the infant was also developing a capacity for the delayed gratification of immediate needs, an essential underpinning of ethical behavior.

Using Schachtel's formulation, Halpin (1966) argued that the principal and the teachers in any school were not able to deal with one another openly or authentically unless the need dominated stresses within the organization were addressed. Halpin suggested that the emergence of focal attention on the part of the principal was analogous to Argyris' (1957) discussion of reality-centered leadership. In that formulation, the principal was able to apprehend reality, and to function appropriate to any given situation that he or she encountered, only when organizational needs were addressed. Specifically, an authentic principal tended to satisfy teachers through goal orientation and social needs fulfillment, thereby allowing teachers to direct their efforts toward teaching. Halpin concluded that the less need dominated attention that existed among teaching members of the faculty, the more open the climate would be and the greater would be the degree of authenticity that existed within the social setting.

Personality Studies

In attempting to develop constitutive and operational definitions of authenticity, research findings in psychology were consulted. The first area of investigation focused on the study of the self. Tiryakian (1968) distinguished between two levels of existence -- the ontic and the ontological. Ontic referred to discrete things, to objects perceived by the senses and having recognizable physical properties. When used with regard to human beings, the ontic orientation referred to the objectification of self and others. The ontic mode of behavior, according to Tiryakian, was inauthentic. The ontological level referred not to a finite entity; rather, it was the essence, the source of identity, and the realness of an entity. To Tiryakian, the authentic person was one who behaved in such a way as to respect the ontological nature of others and himself or herself, indeed, the basis of ethical treatment of others.

Authentic behavior was the avoidance of manipulating other people as if they were inanimate or ontic beings. Inauthentic behavior was seen as the objectification of the self and others in interpersonal relations. The difference between the authentic and the inauthentic individual was the extent to which the person in question treated other persons as if they were inanimate beings. Ethical and unethical treatment of others is grounded in a similar, essential dichotomy. In a similar, but much more recent treatment of this notion, Covey (1992) asserted that the principle-centered leader see people as creative, vital resources who are to be developed,

nurtured, and empowered. He states that problems arise, though, when leaders see people as things to be managed and manipulated. Likewise, Bennis (1989) depicts the fundamental differentiation between leadership and management: "the manager focuses on systems and structures; the leader focuses on people," and "the manager relies on control; the leader relies on trust," (p. 45). Clifton and Nelson (1992) defined the relationship the leader should desire to establish with others as "the process of investing in another person by doing things for that person's own good without consideration of self-reward. Ultimately it [the relationship] is the sum of our responses to another human being" (p. 124). Even when confronted by a potentially divisive negotiations situation, Ury (1991) urges against dealing with the bargaining opponent as an object to be overcome, but as a potential partner to be gained. In fact, Burns' (1978) differentiation between the "transactional" leader and the "transformational" leader essentially distinguishes between those leaders who would undergird leader-follower relationships with the exchange of benefits or objects (transactional), and those leaders who would support the development of individuals within the organization, thereby supporting the growth -- or transformation -- of the organization.

Providing another viewpoint on this issue, Maslow (1961) described the authentic individual as:

> Non-striving, non-needing, non-wishing, i.e., as having transcended needs and drives of the usual sort . . . [and whose] behavior and experiences become per se and self validating, end behavior and experience rather than means behavior and means experience. (p. 255)

The authentic individual to Maslow did not actively seek self validation. Rather, that validation flowed out of the behavior that the person exhibited. The authentic individual was pro-active rather than re-active. Maslow appeared to describe in social scientific terms the folk wisdom paradox that the harder one seems to strive for something, the more difficulty it is to attain. That appeared to be the essential dilemma and paradoxical nature of authenticity. This self validation ostensibly made it possible for authentic individuals to accept responsibility for their own actions, clearly a mark of psychological well-being and character definition. Moreover, this reliance on one's own inner sense of validation allowed leaders to accept responsibility for occurrences and actions within their organizational purview, but for which they were not at fault.

McCullough (1992, pp. 467-524) provides a vivid description of how President Truman was able to live the message of the desk sign, "The Buck Stops Here," in his description of Truman's forthright handling of many instances about which he accepted responsibility without having caused the difficulty. On the other hand, Hill (1984, pp. 34-35) describes the use of scapegoating tactics as a favorite methodology of autocratic leaders. Starratt (1993), though, urges:

> Leaders should have a sense of responsibility for the drama [of social life]. This does not mean that the leader can take responsibility for every detail of the drama. The details of the drama are the responsibility of all those who have parts to play in the drama, but leaders especially will want to see that the drama is working well. They cannot walk away from a dysfunctional organization with the excuse that it is someone else's responsibility. On the contrary, they will feel a great sense of responsibility to call the members of the cast together to discuss how to make the drama work better. (p. 131)

In a psycho-pathological sense, Horney (1950) described the process through which the authentic self was hidden by the subject's system of pride and defensiveness. Horney described a therapy interaction and the process by which a patient came to mature into an authentic being. As therapy continued, the subject started to take over the mental functions carried and covered by the pride system. Once this take-over was accomplished, the subject regained the power of his or her own decisions, beliefs, and feelings. In the regaining of this power of decision, the subject matured into the authentic self. Jourard (1959) indicated in a similar vein that:

> The capacity to disclose [oneself] authentically in response that is appropriate to the setting to the authentic disclosure of the other person in a dyad is probably one of the best indicants of a healthy personality. (p. 502)

Stated in other terms, an authentic individual was one who could relate openly, ethically, and appropriately, given the setting, to another person who was also doing the same. This dyad, or person-to-person relationship, assumed a degree of trust and respect, a clear basis for mutual, ethical behavior. The character imperative of the leader and the reciprocal nature of the leader-follower relationship is summarized well in Phillip's (1992) description of one of America's most acclaimed leaders, Abraham Lincoln:

> Dictatorship, force, coercion -- all were characteristics of tyrants, despots, and oppressors in Lincoln's view. All violated the basic rights of the individual to which he was so committed and upon which the nation was founded. All violated a basic common sense of decency. And here is where Lincoln tied in the Golden Rule and the law of the land to his

> personal leadership style. He treated people the way he would want to be treated, the way he knew others wanted to be treated. (p. 40)

Of course, individuals did not always behave in accordance with the Golden Rule, and so as to minimize "the objectification of self and others" and "manipulation" and to maximize responses "appropriate to the setting." Sergiovanni (1992) summarizes wrong-headed and potentially unethical notions of leadership:

> The official values of management lead us to believe that leaders are characters who single-handedly pull and push organizational members forward by the force of personality, bureaucratic clout, and political know-how. Leaders must be decisive. Leaders must be forceful. Leaders must have a vision. Leaders must successfully manipulate events and people, so that vision becomes a reality. Leaders, in other words must *lead*. (p. 119)

Furthermore, the individual's difficulty as a role incumbent and as a striver to act in an authentic manner was described by Erikson (1956), Lynd (1961), Goffman (1961), and Laing (1960) among others. For the sake of this analysis, the leadership role was conceived of as a "restricted role" (Rosen, 1984) in terms of its being a formal, organizational position of which there are relatively few available. A school principal role is a good example of this type. The dilemma that the individual faced was whether to behave in congruence with his or her ontological, authentic self or to behave in a fashion prescribed by the organizational role. This was not simply seen as a case of role-personality conflict as described by Hoy and Miskel (1996), in which individuals found themselves in roles for which they were not ideally suited, thereby leading to inevitable dissonance. This placed the self and significant others in the social interaction in a state of objectification if the individual behaved solely in a manner prescribed by the organizational role.

Rather, this analysis focused on the leader's having a transcendent self, not necessarily in conflict with the occupied role, but extending beyond that role. For instance, this was reminiscent of Halpin's (1966) argument that the authentic individual assumed a position in which his or her professional role remained secondary to what that person was as a human being. It also adequately supported the contention of Argyris (1957) that the reality-centered leader sometimes had to step out of the normal role requirements according to the dictates of the situation encountered. It appeared that the inauthentic individual was one who functioned strictly "by the book." The inauthentic individual followed the narrow prescription of organizational role

and rarely, if ever, stepped out of that role to change behavior when a change in the situation would seemingly be warranted. The inauthentic individual was, as Halpin described, "two dimensional" (1966, p. 206). The authentic person, on the other hand, was able to function within certain role requirements, but transcended those role requirements as the need arose. The authentic individual ethically treated others as human beings, and was capable of being so treated by those with whom he or she came into contact. This was an ethical *quid pro quo*.

Social Psychological Studies

I also consulted the research literature in social psychology to determine which elements affect the perception by others of an individual's authenticity or inauthenticity. This area of social science research was explored in light of one of the basic assumptions of my study (Henderson, 1982) -- that one could not be authentic or inauthentic, ethical or unethical, in a vacuum.

Attribution Theory.

A useful description of the assumptions and uses of attribution theory -- especially as that theory relates to leadership studies in authenticity and ethics -- is offered by Hunt (1984). Regarding leadership, attribution theory states that followers in an organization will focus on those particular behaviors of the presumed leader taken in an organizational context and that those perceptions will cause the perceiver to decide whether the person observed truly is exhibiting leadership. For instance, Abravenel (1965) presented evidence that one's personality, perceived by others in one's behavior, depended to a large degree on the role that was presumed to apply in any given situation. In terms of authenticity, what could be authentic in one situation could be totally inauthentic in another (especially as that behavior related to the role that one occupied). For instance, a teacher could be viewed as perfectly authentic when he or she established a friendly interaction with the superintendent of schools even though that teacher had privately expressed disdain for the superintendent. This pleasant interaction between teacher and superintendent could well be looked upon as necessary to maintain a functional organizational relationship because of the follower role of the teacher (or because of the known idiosyncratic personality of the superintendent). However, the same behavior on the part of the principal could be viewed as inauthentic behavior by the principal's teachers who could look to the principal for courage and honesty in interpersonal relations.

Further, in order that a person be viewed as authentic or inauthentic, that designation could be made from a variety of people based upon a range of factors. Attribution theory would

state that a person can be designated as authentic or inauthentic based upon others' observation of a variety of characteristics. For instance, Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) found that random designation of people as having a particular ability caused others to treat those people as if they did, in fact, have that ability. Remarkably, the people so designated began performing as if they did have the designated ability. Classic social psychology literature is replete with similar findings (Kelley, 1950; Darley and Cooper; 1972; Cooper, Darley and Henderson, 1974; Dion, Berscheid, and Walster; 1972; Manz and Lueck, 1968; Argyle and McHenry, 1971; Efran, 1974; Landy and Sigal; 1974).

It was also important to realize that, performing within a social context, the authentic individual could not achieve the designation of authenticity and ethical behavior without the attribution of certain traits from others. Jones and Wortman (1973) and Jones, Bell and Aronson (1972) presented studies of subjects who manipulated others -- a kind of objectification or ontic behavior -- and who employed various ingratiation strategies to accomplish their own ends. Jones, Bell and Aronson distinguished between manipulation and exploitation, which were instrumental, sequential strategies, and genuine cooperation, which was related to outcome values. They indicated that the success of an instrumental strategy, such as ingratiation, depended on the observers' confusing one type of interpersonal behavior with another. That is, the strategy depended upon mistakenly identifying a sequential action (typified by an antisocial motive such as self-aggrandizement and exploitation) as being an action of outcome values, which was a pro-social, complimentary, and cooperative motive. Arguing that real leaders must not manipulate, DePree (1989) asserts that:

> The signs of outstanding leadership appear primarily among the followers. Are the followers reaching their potential? Are they learning? Serving? Do they achieve the required results? Do they change with grace? Manage conflict? I would like to ask you to think about the concept of leadership in a certain way. Try to think about a leader, in the words of the gospel writer Luke, as "one who serves." (p. 10)

Interpersonal Attraction.

The act of the leader making a mistake, and admitting same, had the effect of enhancing the leader's image and, presumably, demonstrating a sense of the leader's character. Aronson, Willerman and Floyd (1966) found that making a mistake could be an endearing quality in someone regularly perceived as having a high degree of competence. They asserted that this

action served to humanize a person in others' eyes and increased the liking for that person. That finding was even further supported when a superior ability person behaved clumsily, as that person's image then became more attractive when viewed by average ability persons. Helmreich, Aronson, and LeFan (1970) found that this outcome held except when the judgment was made by those with very high or very low abilities.

On the other hand, if one felt that someone needed or wanted something of him or her, then one was seen as less likely to be attracted to that person as a result of compliments. Naturally, the converse of this was true. One would be more attracted to someone who was perceived to have nothing to gain from the relationship. The same outcome was seen to hold for interpersonal agreement. Jones, Jones and Gergen (1963) found that continually agreeing with someone led to attraction except when the agreeing party was perceived to have something to gain in the relationship. Similarly, Lowe and Goldstein (1970) demonstrated that a favorable rating of a confederate increased the confederate's liking for the subject up to the point where it became clear to the confederate that an ulterior motive was at work in the subject's ratings. Kleinke, Staneski, and Weaver (1972) demonstrated that the continuous use of the another's first name in a conversation was effective in producing interpersonal attraction, except when the user was perceived to have something to gain in the relationship. Also, Aronson and Linder (1965) and Metee (1971) demonstrated that a person preferred another's holding an initially low opinion of that person, and then improving that opinion, over one who held a consistently good opinion of the person. Other indicants of interpersonal attraction, as they related to the concept of authenticity, included Gouldner's (1960) classic formulation of the "norm of reciprocity" in which he stated that, in the absence of other information, when someone liked a person, that person had every reason to reciprocate. Further, Walster and Walster (1963) contended that people believed that similar others were attracted to them. Aronson and Worchel (1966) agreed with Gouldner in stating that the entire similarity and attraction relationship could be accounted for by the pressure for reciprocal liking. Finally, Lott and Lott (1968) and Byrne and Clore (1970) argued that interpersonal attraction was based on the notion that people associated with rewards were liked.

Definition of Leader Authenticity

Based upon the classic literature from several social science disciplines and from the results of the first empirical study on leader authenticity (Henderson, 1982), I concluded that the

authentic leader was distinguished by the aspects of accountability and admitting to mistakes, perceived non-manipulation, and salience of self over role. The followers of the authentic principal saw a person who was real. They saw a person who accepted responsibility for his or her own actions and for the actions of those in the organization. They saw someone who made mistakes, admitted them, and obviously tried not to repeat those mistakes. Their principal sometimes surprised them. The principal did not always act like a principal was supposed to act. If a benefit would accrue to the organization through dressing differently, behaving differently, or saying things out of the ordinary, their principal would not be constrained by perceived role requirements. Their principal was not viewed as a manipulator of people. Finally, there was a perceived congruence between the principal's expressions and the principal's actions. In short, this was an ethical and authentic person first, and administrator second.

The followers of the inauthentic principal, on the other hand, saw a person who played everything strictly "by the book." Their principal functioned within the job very much the way the job description was written, but tended to maintain the effort at that routinized level. The personality of the principal was engulfed by the demands of the office. Those teachers felt that their principal not only lacked a sense of self beyond the role, but tended to deal with them on that level. While that, in and of itself was not unethical or even a breeding ground for unethical conduct, the inauthentic principal was viewed as dealing with teachers in a sterile, objectified sense. They saw this principal as one who willingly would scapegoat others to "save his (or her) own neck." This leader made no mistakes -- or at least none to which the leader was willing to admit. Their principal tended to say one thing and do quite another. Subordinates viewed this principal as a two-dimensional being. This inauthentic principal demonstrated a clear failure of character.

Accordingly, the concept of leader authenticity was defined as the extent to which followers perceived their leader to be maximizing the acceptance of organizational and personal responsibility for actions, outcomes, and mistakes, the non-manipulation of followers, and the salience of self over role. Leader inauthenticity was defined as the extent to which followers perceived their leader to be "passing the buck" and blaming others and circumstances for errors and outcomes, to be manipulating followers, and to be concerned primarily with operating subordinate to the prescribed organizational role. The Leader Authenticity Scale (see Appendix A) was confirmed as being a highly reliable instrument and substantial content and construct

validity evidence was presented for its use. It was easy to argue that the ethical underpinnings of the authentic principal were apparent, and that the failures of character in the inauthentic principal were equally revealed.

Subsequent Authenticity Studies

The concept of leader authenticity and the Leader Authenticity Scale proved to be of substantial heuristic value and produced certain interesting and illuminating findings. For example, Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) and Hoy and Kupersmith (1984) demonstrated a link between leader authenticity and trust among staff in elementary schools. Hoy and Kupersmith, in fact, found that leader authenticity was significantly correlated with all three aspects of organizational trust: trust in principal, trust in colleagues, and trust in organization (1984, p. 85). Hoy and Henderson (1983) demonstrated that leader authenticity of elementary school principals was significantly related to openness in organizational climate and to humanism in pupil-control orientation of the school. Ding (1991) examined the relationship between principals' authenticity and teacher job satisfaction and found a significantly positive relationship between principals' authenticity and teacher job satisfaction. Given the ethical basis for the authentic principal's behavior, none of these results are particularly surprising.

Meyer (1991) examined the relationship existing between the concepts of perceived leader authenticity and the perceived instructional leadership behaviors of middle-level principals. Meyer identified several findings of note that once again have clear ethical overtones:

1. A good instructional manager is an accountable, highly visible, supervisor of instruction who provides performance incentives to both teachers and learners without manipulation.
2. Teachers have different perceptions about authenticity and instructional management than supervisors and principals.
3. Male teachers have some perceptions different than female teachers.
4. Older teachers with more years of working with the current principal perceived the principal to be more manipulative than other groups did.
5. Teachers in higher enrollment schools have higher perceptions of the frequency or quality of some principal behaviors than teachers from smaller enrollment schools.

Lasserre (1990) examined the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the context variables of teacher interactions, principal-teacher relations, and leader authenticity and the personal variables of teacher self-efficacy and teacher self-confidence. Lasserre found a strong

relationship between the context measure for school climate and the personal variable of self-efficacy. Teacher interaction was significantly related to personal teaching efficacy and principal-teacher relations was significantly related to teaching efficacy. The perception of the faculties regarding relationships between their own personal efficacy, teaching efficacy, and total efficacy and leader authenticity were found to be statistically significant. In short, if teachers were treated in an ontological fashion they tended to treat their peers in such a manner. This enhanced their sense that they could make a difference in the lives in their care. Such is the basis for ethical treatment of peers and clients.

Benjamin (1987) studied the relationships among teacher perceptions of clinical supervisory practices, principal authenticity, and supervisory outcomes. The importance of perceived principal authenticity in predicting a successful clinical supervisory experience was identified. Benjamin also concluded that, in assessing the potential for implementation of clinical supervision, the readiness and authenticity of the teacher, as well as the individuality of the principal-teacher relationship were important factors. Once again, the importance and the effectiveness of genuine, ethical interpersonal behavior was demonstrated.

Teacher and Leader Authenticity

Hoffman (1993) tested a short form of the Leader Authenticity Scale (see Appendix B) containing sixteen items, and found that instrument to be highly reliable. Because there was no similar measure of teacher authenticity, Hoffman developed and tested a new scale similar to the LAS, the Teacher Authenticity Scale (see Appendix C). Teacher authenticity is the degree to which other teachers are viewed as accepting responsibility for their actions, as being non-manipulating, and demonstrating a salience of self over role. Items from the shortened version of the LAS were adapted to measure authentic interactions between teachers. For example, "Teachers here manipulate other teachers" and "Teachers are very defensive about any criticism" was developed from "The principal is very defensive about any criticism." The sixteen new items referring to teacher behavior were called the Teacher Authenticity Scale (TAS). As expected, the two measures of authenticity were highly reliable and were supported in content and construct validity evidence. The scales emerged as predicted -- a measure of leader authenticity and a measure of teacher authenticity. Both scales, then, are based upon perceived ethical behavior of the school's leader and the school's professional staff.

Hoffman (1993) also found that openness in school climate was related, as predicted, to authenticity; in general, the more open the climate of middle schools, the more authentic both teacher and principal. Authenticity of teacher relations was best explained by collegial teacher-teacher relations, while principal authenticity was best explained by supportive principal-teacher relations. Principal authenticity and principal trust were related in Hoffman's study, and open, authentic behavior appeared to be a key factor in generating faculty trust in the principal. Further, principal and teacher authenticity were also related. Authentic behavior between the principal and teachers generated authentic interactions among teachers, or authentic interactions among teachers promoted authentic principal-teacher interaction. Hoffman speculated that the two levels of authenticity were most likely mutually dependent.

Authenticity Beyond School Environments

My colleague, Susan M. Brookhart, and I (1996) designed a revised Leader Authenticity Scale (the Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale or OLAS -- see Appendix D) for use in determining the authenticity of both educational leaders and leaders outside of educational settings. As has been discussed, the initial Leader Authenticity Scale had focused on ascertaining a school principal's authenticity as perceived by the school's faculty and staff. A Staff Authenticity Scale (SAS -- see Appendix E), derived from the Teacher Authenticity Scale and designed for use in educational and non-educational organizations, was also developed and tested. Leader and staff authenticity were related as predicted to organizational health, organizational climate, and leader effectiveness. A causal model predicting organizational health and organizational climate from leader authenticity and staff authenticity was constructed.

This study supports the concept of leader authenticity as central to leadership in a broader variety of institutional contexts than elementary schools and supports the use of the Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale to measure it. The relationship between perceived leader authenticity and leader effectiveness was also tested for the first time and that relationship was found to be very strong. Further, the Staff Authenticity instrument was constructed and tested and found to be predictive (when working with leader authenticity) of organizational climate and organizational health. Predicted relationships between OLAS and SAS and other variables were obtained in a sample of educational leaders in a variety of positions in basic education, higher education, and other public institutions. This study forms the basis for further study of this expanded conception of leader authenticity and staff authenticity.

Conclusion

The linkages between notions of ethical leadership and leader's authenticity seem apparent. The school leader's selflessly working to perform in the best interest of others -- internal or external organizational "clients" such as teachers, students, and parents -- is a respectful act. This is directly analogous to the leader authenticity aspect of non-manipulation. The school leader's possessing courage and a strength of character is another ethical imperative. To accept responsibility for actions and mistakes and to move to correct those difficulties is a *sine qua non* of effective schools. This attribute directly relates to the leader authenticity aspect of accountability. Finally, the ethical school leader exhibits the actions of servant leadership and is clearly honest -- both to herself or himself and also to the school's stakeholders. The ethical school leader is not a puppet, but is, rather, a real person possessing a moral compass for the leader's expressions and actions. This leader is not just a role incumbent per the leaders authenticity aspect of salience of self over role -- this leader is a real person.

If we believe the empirical evidence presented in these studies, in what will authentic and ethical behavior of the part of school administrators and teachers result? We will have schools in which interpersonal trust and respect, ethical behavior, and positive morale and job satisfaction predominate. Moreover -- and of great importance to those who would call for increased school productivity and enhanced standards -- authentic behavior also results in schools in which accountability, teacher self-efficacy, effective teacher supervision, and leader effectiveness are evident. These ethically-based schools are places where students have a chance to model behavior on the part of teachers and principals that is accepting of responsibility, that exhibits a sincere concern for all of the stakeholders in the school, and that demonstrates that the teachers and principals are real human beings who treat others according to their needs and not according to monolithic rules. These are schools where young people are encouraged to succeed academically and interpersonally. These are schools that work.

James E. Henderson is Professor and Dean in the Duquesne University School of Education. Dr. Henderson is also the Director of the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program for Educational Leaders in Duquesne's School of Education.

Appendix A

Leader Authenticity Scale

On the following pages are some statements about the school setting. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular school. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

1. The principal is obsessed with rules. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. The principal is willing to admit to mistakes when they are made. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. When dealing with a teacher, the principal behaves like a know-it-all. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. The principal is not afraid to admit when he (or she) doesn't know something 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. The principal is very defensive about any criticism. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. The principal is honest in face-to-face interactions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Many times the principal will say one thing to teachers and something quite different to students or parents. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. The principal is authentic. 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. It's not uncommon to see the principal pit one teacher against another..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. The principal's beliefs and actions are consistent..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. The principal finds it difficult to accept failure. 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. It's an unwritten rule around here that you don't criticize the principal..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. If the principal makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error. 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. The principal accepts and learns from mistakes. 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. The principal usually has teachers do things to make the principal look good..... 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. After meeting together in situations like evaluation conferences, I feel that I know the principal better as a person..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix A (continued)

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

.

17. The principal doesn't have much to do with teachers unless a teacher can help the principal in some way. 1 2 3 4 5 6

18. The principal is an opportunist in dealing with teachers..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

19. The principal encourages "give-and-take" discussion with individual teachers..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

20. If something goes wrong in the school, the principal is sure to blame someone else on the staff. 1 2 3 4 5 6

21. The principal is easily swayed by parent pressure. 1 2 3 4 5 6

22. The principal appears to have "rehearsed" answers for teachers during conferences..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

23. The principal is a person first, and an administrator second. 1 2 3 4 5 6

24. The principal manipulates the teachers..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

25. The principal is a phony..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

26. Discussing serious issues, the principal likes to "play games."..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

27. The principal accepts responsibility for the principal's own actions and for the progress of the school..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

28. Teachers are afraid if they confide in the principal that the information will be used against them. 1 2 3 4 5 6

29. The principal seems to talk at you and not with you. 1 2 3 4 5 6

30. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, the principal stands behind that person. 1 2 3 4 5 6

31. The principal would not hesitate to put a board member or parent in his/her place if necessary. 1 2 3 4 5 6

32. The principal likes to take credit for teachers' accomplishments, but doesn't want to be blamed for any failures. 1 2 3 4 5 6

© James E. Henderson and Wayne K. Hoy, 1982. All rights reserved.

Appendix B

Leader Authenticity Scale (Modified Version)

On the following pages are some statements about the school setting. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular school. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

1. The principal doesn't have much to do with teachers unless the teacher can help him/her in some way 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. The principal is willing to admit to mistakes when they are made 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. The principal finds it difficult to accept failure 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. If the principal makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. The principal is very defensive about any criticism 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. The principal is honest in face-to-face interactions 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. The principal likes to take credit for accomplishments but doesn't want to be blamed for any failures 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. The principal runs the school "by the book." 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. The principal's beliefs and actions are consistent 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. If something is wrong in the school, the principal is sure to blame someone else on the staff 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. The principal manipulates teachers 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. When dealing with a teacher, the principal behaves like a know-it-all 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. The principal seems to talk at you and not with you 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, the principal stands behind that person 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. The principal accepts and learns from mistakes 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. The principal accepts responsibility for the principal's own actions and for the progress of the school 1 2 3 4 5 6

© James D. Hoffman, 1993. All rights reserved.

Appendix C

Teacher Authenticity Scale

On the following pages are some statements about the school setting. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular school. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

1. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, other teachers stand behind that person 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Teachers in this school operate "by the book." 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. The teachers' beliefs and actions are consistent 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Teachers here like to take credit for accomplishments but don't want to be blamed for any failures 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Teachers here accept and learn from mistakes 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Teachers in this school are honest in face-to face interactions 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Teachers here are willing to admit to mistakes when they are made 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Teachers here accept responsibility for their own actions and for the progress of the school 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Teachers are very defensive about any criticism 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Teachers don't have much to do with other teachers unless the teacher can help them in some way 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Other teachers here find it difficult to accept failure 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. If a teacher in this school makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error 1 2 3 4 5 6
13. If something is wrong in this school, the teachers are sure to blame someone else on the staff 1 2 3 4 5 6
14. Teachers here manipulate other teachers 1 2 3 4 5 6
15. When dealing with a teacher, other teachers behave like know-it-alls 1 2 3 4 5 6
16. Teachers here seem to talk at you and not with you 1 2 3 4 5 6

© James D. Hoffman, 1993. All rights reserved.

Appendix D

ORGANIZATION: _____

Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: What follows are some statements about organizational settings. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular organization. Please read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

First impressions are usually the best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number to the right of each statement. Please give your opinion on every statement. If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, please use the one closest to the way you feel about your own organization.

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

1. My supervisor doesn't have much to do with staff members unless the staff member can help him/her in some way. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. My supervisor is willing to admit to mistakes when they are made. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. My supervisor finds it difficult to accept failure. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. If my supervisor makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. My supervisor is very defensive about any criticism. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. My supervisor is honest in face-to-face interactions. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. My supervisor likes to take credit for accomplishments but doesn't want to be blamed for any failures. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. My supervisor runs the organization "by the book." 1 2 3 4 5 6

Organizational Leader Authenticity Scale (continued)

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

9. My supervisor's beliefs and actions are consistent. 1 2 3 4 5 6

10. If something is wrong in the organization, my supervisor is sure to blame someone else on the staff. 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. My supervisor manipulates staff members. 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. When dealing with a staff member, my supervisor behaves like a know-it-all. 1 2 3 4 5 6

13. My supervisor seems to talk at you and not with you. 1 2 3 4 5 6

14. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, my supervisor stands behind that person. 1 2 3 4 5 6

15. My supervisor accepts and learns from mistakes. 1 2 3 4 5 6

16. My supervisor accepts responsibility for the supervisor's own actions and for the progress of the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Please return your completed questionnaire in the addressed envelope. Your responses will be held anonymous and will only be reported as aggregated data. Thank you for your assistance with this project.

© James E. Henderson and Susan M. Brookhart, 1996. All rights reserved.

Appendix E

ORGANIZATION: _____

Staff Authenticity Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: What follows are some statements about organizational settings. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements as they relate to your particular organization. Please read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

First impressions are usually the best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number to the right of each statement. Please give your opinion on every statement. If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, please use the one closest to the way you feel about your own organization.

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

1. Whenever authority is delegated to a staff member, other staff members stand behind that person. 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Staff members in my organization operate "by the book." 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Staff members' beliefs and actions are consistent. 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Staff members here like to take credit for accomplishments but don't want to be blamed for any failures. 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Staff members here accept and learn from mistakes. 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Staff members in my organization are honest in face-to face interactions. 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Staff members here are willing to admit to mistakes when they are made. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Staff Authenticity Scale (continued)

1- Strongly Agree **2**- Moderately Agree **3**- Agree slightly more than disagree
4- Disagree slightly more than agree **5**- Moderately Disagree **6**- Strongly Disagree

8. Staff members here accept responsibility for their own actions and for the progress of the organization. 1 2 3 4 5 6

9. Staff members are very defensive about any criticism. 1 2 3 4 5 6

10. Staff members don't have much to do with other staff members unless the other staff member can help them in some way. 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. Other staff members in my organization find it difficult to accept failure. 1 2 3 4 5 6

12. If a staff member in my organization makes a mistake, a reason is made to cover-up for the error. 1 2 3 4 5 6

13. If something is wrong in my organization, the staff members are sure to blame someone else on the staff. 1 2 3 4 5 6

14. Staff members here manipulate other staff members. 1 2 3 4 5 6

15. When dealing with a staff member, other staff members behave like know-it-alls. 1 2 3 4 5 6

16. Staff members here seem to talk at you and not with you. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Please return your completed questionnaire in the addressed envelope. Your responses will be held anonymous and will only be reported as aggregated data. Thank you for your assistance with this project.

© James E. Henderson and Susan M. Brookhart, 1996. All rights reserved.

References

Abravenel, E. A. (1965). A psychological analysis of the concept of role. In R. Brown, Social psychology. New York: The Free Press.

Argyle, M. & McHenry, R. (1971). Do spectacles really affect judgments of intelligence? British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10, 27-29.

Argyris, C. (1957). Personality and organization. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Aronson, E., & Linder, D. E. (1965). Gain and loss of esteem as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1, 156-171.

Aronson, E., Willerman, B., & Floyd, J. (1966). The effect of a pratfall on increasing interpersonal attractiveness. Psychonomic Science, 4, 227-228.

Aronson, E., & Worchel, P. (1966). Similarity versus liking as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. Psychonomic Science, 5, 157-158.

Bales, R. F. (1958) Task roles and social roles in problem solving groups. In Maccoby, E., Newcomb, T., & Hartley, E. (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt.

Benjamin, S. M. K. (1987). An investigation of the relationships among teacher perceptions of clinical supervisory practices, principal authenticity, and supervisory outcomes (Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1361A.

Bennis, W. (1989). On becoming a leader. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brandt, R. (Ed.). (1992). Transforming leadership. Educational Leadership, 49 (5).

Brumbaugh, R. B. (1971). Authenticity and theories of administrative behavior. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 108-112.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Byrne, D., & Clore, G. L. (1970). A reinforcement model of evaluative responses. Personality: An International Journal, 1, 103-128.

Carling, F. (1962). And yet we are human. London: Chatto and Windus.

Carter, L. (1954). Recording and evaluating the performance of individuals as members of small groups. Personnel Psychology, 7, 477-484.

Clifton, D. O., & Nelson, P. (1992). Soar with your strengths. New York: Delacorte Press.

Cooper, J., Darley, J. M., & Henderson, J. E. (1974). On the effectiveness of deviant and conventionally appearing communications: A field experiment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 752-757.

Covey, S. R. (1992). Principle-centered leadership. Provo, Utah: Covey Leadership Center.

Darley, J., & Cooper, J. M. (1972). The 'clean for Gene' phenomenon: Deciding to vote for or against a candidate on the basis of the physical appearance of his supporters. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2, 24-33.

DePree, M. (1989). Leadership is an art. New York: Doubleday.

Ding, W. (1993). Relationships among principals' leadership behavior, principals' authenticity, and teacher job satisfaction in selected junior high schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 2617A.

Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 285-290.

Efran, M. G. (1974). The effect of physical appearance on the judgment of guilt, interpersonal attraction, and severity of recommended punishment in a simulated jury task. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 8, 45-54.

Erikson, E. H. (1956). The problem of ego identity. The Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 4, 56-121.

Etzioni, A. (1968). Basic human needs, alienation and inauthenticity. American Sociological Review, 33, 880-881.

Festinger, L. (1964). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Festinger, L. (1957). Conflict, decision, and dissonance. New York: Row, Peterson,.

Festinger, L., Riecken, H., & Schachter, S. (1956). When prophecy fails. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.

Getzels, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. School Review, 65, 423-441.

Goffman, E. (1961). On the characteristics of total institutions: The inmate world. In D. Cressey (ed.) The prison. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 25, 161-178.

Halpin, A. W. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillan.

Helmreich, R., Aronson, E., & LeFan, J. (1970). To err is humanizing--sometimes: Effects of self-esteem, competence and a pratfall on inter-personal attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 259-264.

Henderson, J. (1982). Leadership authenticity: The development and validation of an operational measure (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 993A.

Henderson, J. E. (1998). Leadership, character growth, and authenticity. In T. Rusnak (Ed.), *An Integrated Approach to Character Education*. (pp. 77-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Henderson, J. E. & Brookhart, S. M. (1996). Leader authenticity: Key to organizational climate, health and perceived leader effectiveness. The Journal of Leadership Studies, 3 (4), 87-103.

Henderson, J. E., & Hoy W. K. (1982). Leader authenticity: The development and test of an operational measure. Educational and Psychological Research, 3, 63-75.

Hill, M. A. (1984). The law of the father: Leadership and symbolic authority in psychoanalysis. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hoffman, J. D. (1993). The organizational climate of middle schools and dimensions of authenticity and trust. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.

Horney, K. (1950). Neurosis and human growth: The struggle toward self-realization. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Hoy, W. K., & Henderson, J. E. (1983). Pupil authenticity, school climate, and pupil-control orientation. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 29, 123-130.

Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W. (1984). Principal authenticity and faculty trust: Key elements in organizational behavior. Planning and Changing, 15, 80-88.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1996). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hunt, S. M. (1984). The role of leadership in the construction of reality. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Jones, E. E., Bell, L., & Aronson, E. (1972). The reciprocation of attraction from similar and dissimilar others. In C. McClintock (Ed.), Experimental social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jones, E. E., Jones, R. G., & Gergen, K. J. (1963). Some conditions affecting the evaluation of a conformist. Journal of Personality, 31, 270-288.

Jones, E. E., & Wortman, C. (1973). Ingratiation: An attributional approach. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Jourard, S. (1959). Healthy personality and self-disclosure. Mental Hygiene, 43, 499-507.

Kelley, H. H. (1950). The warm-cold variable in first impressions of persons. Journal of Personality, 18, 431-439.

Kleinke, C. L., Staneski, R. A., & Weaver, P. (1972). Evaluation of a person who uses another person's name in ingratiating and noningratiating situations. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 8, 457-466.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Laing, R. D. (1960). The divided self. London: Tavistock Publications.

Landy, D., & Sigall, H. (1974). Beauty is talent: Task evaluation as a function of the performer's physical attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29.

Lasserre, C. M. (1990). Relationships between selected school context variables and teacher self-efficacy and self-confidence (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 364A.

Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. (1968). A learning theory approach to interpersonal attitudes. In A. Greenwald, T. Brock, & T. McOstrom (Eds.). Psychological foundations of attitudes. New York: Academic Press.

Lowe, C. A. & Goldstein, J. W. (1970). Reciprocal liking and attribution of ability: Mediating effects of perceived intent and personal involvement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 291-298.

Lynd, H. M. (1961). On shame and the search for identity. New York: Science Editions, Inc.

Manz, W., & Lueck, H. (1968). Influence of wearing glasses on personality ratings: Cross cultural validation of an old experiment. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 27, 704.

Maslow, A. H. (1961). Peak experiences as acute identity-experiences. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 21, 254-260.

McCullough, D. (1992). Truman. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Mettee, D. R. (1971). Rejection of unexpected success as a function of the negative consequences of accepting success. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, 332-341.

Meyer, T. M. (1991). Perceived leader authenticity as an effective indicator of perceived instructional leadership behavior in middle school principals (Doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 2617A.

Perlmutter, H. V. (1959). Person to person: A psychological analysis of cross-cultural relationships. Topeka: Menninger Foundation.

Phillips, D. T. (1992). Lincoln on leadership. New York: Warner Books.

Rinder, I. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1952). Varieties of inauthenticity. Phylon, 13, 270-275.

Rosen, D. M. (1984). Leadership systems in world cultures. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectations and pupil's intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Schachtel, E. G. (1959). Metamorphosis. New York: Basic Books.

Seeman, M. (1953). Role conflict and ambivalence in leadership. American Sociological Review, 18, 373-380.

Seeman, M. (1960). Sociological status and leadership. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Seeman, M. (1966). Status and identity: The problem of authenticity. Pacific Sociological Review, 9, 67-73.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Starratt, R. J. (1993). The drama of leadership. London: The Falmer Press.

Terry, R. W. (1993). Authentic leadership: Courage in action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tiryakian, E. A. (1968). The existential self and the person. In C. Gordon & K. Gergen (Eds.), The self in social interaction . New York: Wiley.

Ury, W. (1991). Getting past no: Negotiating with difficult people. New York: Bantam Books.

Walster, E., & Walster G. W. (1963). Effect of expecting to be liked on choice of associates. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 402-404.